HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 43 Saturday, October 27, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Campaign Climax: A resurgent spirit of American nationalism has sent Adlai Stevenson sprawling in this critical period of the campaign. That is one current analysis of the situation resulting from Ike's rejection of Adlai's proposed ban on H-bomb tests.

This spirit of nationalism, which may well be recognized as the decisive element in an Ike victory at the polls on November 6, started to make itself felt when the President first restated the official policy on the H-bomb tests and flatly turned down Adlai's demand to suspend all such tests.

The Horatius-at-the-bridge of this conflict of policy is "Taft-man" Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who has a good record of standing firm against proposals like Adlai's for years. Strauss, a devoted follower of Senator Taft, first got on the AEC through Taft's support ten years ago and his elevation to the Chairmanship in 1953 was virtually the only appointment of importance wrung by Taft from the White House crowd since Ike has been in power.

Much credit accrues to the President for reportedly resisting demands of the Republican liberal bloc and leftists in the White House Palace Guard who wanted him to yield to Adlai's stand. Incredible as it may seem, there appears to have been some behind-the-scenes opinion that Adlai's stand would prove the soundest as well as the most popular.

The H-bomb controversy in the campaign — it is important to remember — began to develop just as keen concern about the outcome of the campaign had mounted in the councils of the GOP. This was the time, *circa* end of September, when David Lawrence — known as a strong Ike supporter — was predicting (September 28) that Adlai might win in a landslide. The "America first" stand of Eisenhower working against the appeasement stand adopted by Adlai sent the Ike stock upward and by the time the Bulganin letter incident had taken place, Ike's chances of victory were rated higher than they had been early in September.

Behind Democratic Doors: Among the tribulations of the Democrats, the uncooperative attitude of Carmine deSapio, Tammany boss, ranks high. Word has gone around that "Tammany is knifing the top of the ticket" in Manhattan and that this attitude has spread to the other four boroughs. The Democratic newspaper, the *New York Post*, has uttered (October 21) this editorial complaint:

"The man who must bear primary responsibility for this condition is Carmine deSapio. What is done under his aegis in New York County inevitably colors the tone and spirit of the metropolitan campaign. [A *Post* reporter had found that in Democratic clubhouses names and pictures of local candidates prevailed, but no pictures of Stevenson and Kefauver.] It has been uncharitably suggested that deSapio lost interest in the national ticket when Governor Harriman lost the nomination. There have been murmurs that he felt he had no private stake in the victory of the two men he opposed at Chicago." This explains why Adlai appears so weak in straw votes from the New York area.

Insiders say that the reason for deSapio's defection is that he had demanded of the Stevenson high command a promise of patronage (if Adlai were elected) which that high command refused to give him, probably preferring to play ball with the Liberal party leaders first. There still circulates some talk of a deal to bring Tammany back into active participation to bolster the Stevenson cause.

One of the Democratic news sources of HUMAN EVENTS came out from a smoke-filled room in the Mayflower to tell us that the leaders of the party are very concerned about Adlai's slump and fear that it may affect elections to the House and Senate on which the Democrats had counted. Also, it seems, there is a wringing of hands about Adlai's position on the H-bomb tests. Our informant says that every important adviser of the Democratic candidate either initially advised against the stand or later urged abandonment of the issue; all — save one who is regarded as Adlai's evil genius. That is Chester Bowles, former Governor of Connecticut and former Ambassador to India when Truman was President. This former high new Dealer has shaped Adlai's ideas on the subject and influenced his handling of the whole matter.

Revolt In Europe: Amid the voluminous dispatches reporting spread of anti-Soviet revolt in Eastern Europe, expert observers in Washington seek to trace the real impulse behind the whole phenomenon. They come up with the following significant findings, principally on Poland, the mother of the revolt:

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The meaning of the Polish uprising is not, as the pundits say, a clash between Gomulka symbolizing Polish nationalism versus Moscow, betokening Soviet imperialism. In Washington, Gomulka is thought to be on all fours with Khrushchev. To keep his job, the Polish leader is exploiting Polish nationalism, conceding that much to the people, and Moscow is collaborating with him by withdrawing cruisers and troops, etc. The pattern is somewhat the same in Hungary.

The truth is that a terrific groundswell in Poland (very similar to movements in other puppet lands, such as Hungary) has been under way for some time and any Government, to stay in power, has had to trim its sails to this movement. Observers describe it as possessing the three following factors which explain its rise and strength:

(1) Polish nationalism is fused with the Catholicism of the country in defiance of the Soviet Russians. On August 15, the Feast of the Assumption, about one million Poles visited Czestochowa (the Lourdes of Poland) in a mass demonstration against Russia. The occasion derived further importance from the fact that it was on the anniversary of Pilsudski's defeat of the Red Army in 1920, called the "miracle of the Vistula." Catholicism and nationalism work together somewhat similarly in largely Catholic Hungary.

(2) The Polish revolt also sprang from the economic situation which has brought a shortage of food and consumer goods. The Kremlin masters designed the economy to stunt agricultural production and expand manufacturing production, particularly heavy industry. This was to suit Russia, for it wanted to siphon off to itself industrial products from Poland. Here again, on the economic front, the enemy is Russia.

(3) The attempted compulsory indoctrination of Polish youth, since the Reds took over in 1945, has proved a fiasco and has strongly backfired. The young people learned to hate the Communism crammed down their throats and were the first to mount the barricades against the Reds.

What the U.S. should do about it is a matter which engages much discussion in Governmental circles here. Many strongly feel that no Tito-type aid from the U.S. Government to the Warsaw-Budapest Governments should be extended. Nothing that would help Gomulka or Nagy (or whoever may be their puppet successors, tomorrow) to ride the groundswell should be done, and a clear distinction should be made in propaganda and diplomacy between the puppet governments and the people.

One proposal is that the U.S. Government and private agencies should offer food to the Polish people and also goods, notably clothing. One suggestion is to have a citizens' committee, perhaps headed by George Meany of the AFL-CIO, collect gifts of clothing from the public to be sent to Poland as a test. If Gomulka accepts, he would become suspect in Moscow eyes. If he should reject the proposal, he would further anger the Polish people.

If Stevenson Wins: Democratic attacks on "the men around Eisenhower" have provoked Washington pressmen to draw up lists of likely appointees if Stevenson is elected, illustrating what the country would "be in for." The list-makers note that even if Adlai should upset their predictions by naming several unknowns, the effect on policy would be the same. For example, Chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission probably will not go to Adlai's logical choice, J. Robert Oppenheimer, but to an "Oppenheimer man." The Washington consensus is as follows:

Secretary of State: Acheson, Kennan, Finletter, and Bowles all have been mentioned. Acheson would prefer to wield his considerable influence from outside the cabinet, while Finletter and Bowles have been mentioned for other posts, so George F. Kennan emerges as Stevenson's number one choice.

Washington pundits are interested to see how Stevenson would manage a Kennan appointment, in view of the fact that Adlai has specifically disowned the architect of "containment." (See HUMAN EVENTS for September 29.) If Chester Bowles does not get the State Department spot, it is deemed likely that a new foreign aid agency (like Stassen's FOA) will be set up for him to head.

Defense: If Stevenson finds it feasible to bring in Kennan, Thomas K. Finletter is considered the best prospect for this job. *Labor:* Walter Reuther is considered a natural — if he wants it. *Agriculture:* Charles Brannan is the logical choice, although some doubt has been expressed as to whether he would try a comeback. *Interior:* Oscar Chapman has the inside track, subject to the same conditions as Brannan. *Postmaster General:* Considered in the bag for Stevenson's campaign manager, James A. Finnegan. *Health, Education and Welfare:* Wilson Wyatt, ex-housing administrator, might accept an appointment to this spot.

States' Rights Party: The fledgling States' Rights party seems likely to wage its strongest and most effective campaign in Virginia. Victory for this party in that state is not excluded. But capture of sufficient votes to wield a balance of power seems a more likely possibility. At least politicians of both major parties, particularly of the GOP, express fear of expected strength for T. Coleman Andrews, the party's Presidential candidate. Thus, I. Lee Potter, Virginia Republican chairman, on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

October 24 stated that the States' Rights party "had presented a bad situation, one we didn't deserve." The A.P. on the next day from Richmond reported Republicans and Democrats alike as "openly alarmed at the wound Andrews may inflict on their candidates."

Early this week, Senator Harry Byrd — bellwether of conservatives in the state — came out urging election of Democratic congressional candidates, but pointedly omitting mention of the Presidential contest. The followers of T. Coleman Andrews welcome this silence of Byrd on the Presidency; they had feared he might endorse Stevenson. On the other hand, States' Righters fear the invasion of Virginia by Eisenhower himself on October 29, for a speech in Richmond. T. Coleman Andrews apparently draws much of his strength from those who voted for Ike in '52.

ON THE AIR: T. Coleman Andrews program. NBC TV from Washington on Saturday, October 27, from 1:30 to 2:00 P.M. EDT.

Same program, ABC TV from New York Saturday, October 27 from 7:00 to 7:30 P.M. EDT. (Also over ABC radio 9:30 to 10:00 P.M., EDT.)

Same program NBC radio, from New York, Monday, October 29, 10:15 to 10:30 P.M., EST. Thomas H. Werdel over NBC radio, 10:15-10:30 P.M., Tuesday, October 30, from Hollywood.

Metropolitan Washington area — States' Rights party meeting on Monday, October 29 at 8:00 P.M. at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, Boys Gymnasium, 4301 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md. Speakers, Clarence Manion, Vivien Kellems.

Labor Front: Testifying before the Gore Committee on Elections early this month, Walter Reuther launched an abortive propaganda coup for his United Auto Workers union. Reuther's claim that the political "contributions" of UAW members are "voluntary" drew a quick counterblast from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Reuther cited a directive issued by the UAW August 3, allowing UAW members to divert part of their dues away from political war chests and into charitable organizations. To effect this transfer, the worker must send a registered letter stating his intentions to UAW's national headquarters.

Speaking for the U.S. Chamber, General Counsel William Barton said that this device "violates every principle of the secret ballot" because it forces the union member to "disclose his voting preference" by taking "an open position contrary to the Union's announced political stand."

Barton pointed out "that very few minority members of a union would exercise such a veto. They have reason to be apprehensive about the possible embarrassment and other trouble that might come to them if they so disclosed their disagreement with the union's political views. Thus their right to a secret ballot is subtly being taken from them.

"The situation," Barton concluded, "clearly shows the great need for right-to-work laws which forbid compulsory unionism."

Welker: One-time Senator Glen Taylor's announcement that he is a write-in candidate against Republican Senator Herman Welker of Idaho causes political observers in that state to shift Welker's status from likely loser to probable victor.

Taylor, noted principally as a banjo player and as Vice-Presidential nominee on the Communist-manipulated Progressive Party ticket in 1948, claims he was counted out of the Democratic senatorial nomination in the state's recent primary. His independent write-in campaign admittedly is a move of revenge.

He lost the nomination to 32-year-old Frank Church, Boise attorney whose victory margin first was announced as 200 votes; it was promptly reduced to 170 votes, however, by disclosure of a counting error.

Taylor claimed there were many other similar errors. To prove his point, he canvassed the town of Mountain View, possessing 448 registered Democrats. He says he talked with 443 of them, that 97 said they voted for him, 195 for Church. The official Mountain View count gave Taylor 71 votes, Church 249.

Taylor offered his findings in support of a request for a statewide recount but was told they had no standing in the absence of individual notarized affidavits. He went back to Mountain View to undertake the door-to-door process again but this time was denied permission by local authorities. The ultimate upshot of the rejection of his demands now is the write-in candidacy.

Church, a newcomer to politics, is regarded in Idaho as far more conservative than Taylor. However, because Welker was one of the small group of Senators who adamantly opposed censuring Senator McCarthy, Church's campaign has been receiving substantial help from such ultra-liberal organizations as New York's notorious National Committee for an Effective Congress.

New York Times: *The New York Times*, regarded by many as a bulwark of traditionalism, shows what others regard as its true colors in an editorial stating its preferences on various Senatorial races — quite gratuitously and seemingly unnecessarily, in the case of states thousands of miles from the paper's home bailiwick.

It says, for instance, that "the right-wing Republican incumbents in Idaho and Illinois, Senators Welker and Dirksen, ought to be defeated"; it would be "disastrous" if West Virginia voters should choose the GOP nominee, former Senator Chapman Revercomb, because of his "extreme"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position in the '40's on displaced persons legislation; and it "is horrifying to know that Democratic Governor Herman Talmadge of Georgia will be elected without opposition.

"A victory by Rep. Clifton Young, Republican, in the Senatorial election in Nevada will mean a defeat for the McCarran organization in that state now backing the Democratic incumbent, Senator Alan Bible," says the *Times*. "That is reason enough to elect Mr. Young."

Press observers say the selections should not be surprising, but rather are further evidences of the paper's true leftist internationalism.

Daily Worker: Long-time experts on the Communist movement warn against acceptance, at face value, of *The Daily Worker's* reaction to events in Poland.

Official Red organ in this country, *The Daily Worker* published an unusually lengthy editorial praising the new independence of the Polish government and hailing the re-accession to power of Wladyslaw Gomulka as a "vindication of justice and socialist principles." It spoke glowingly of the complete independence of each country's Communist movement, and said differences between Poland and Moscow soon will be settled amicably through discussions between two equally sovereign governments.

The experts, most of whom have dabbled in Communism themselves at one time or another and thus know the deviosities to which the party resorts, point out that Moscow's loss of control over Poland already had become clear when this editorial was published on Monday, laying down the American party line.

Thus, they view it as accepting the inevitable; and its prime purpose, they say, undoubtedly was to try to demonstrate that the Communist party, U.S.A., is not merely a creature of Moscow, dictated to by Moscow. They offer long odds that when the Subversive Activities Control Board holds new hearings on the nature of the Communist party, as the Supreme Court has ordered it to do, this stand will be offered as evidence that it is not controlled by a foreign power.

They insist that such a position, even though purely for domestic consumption, would have been taken only with approval of Moscow; and that when the chips go down, Moscow still calls the shots for American Communists.

Book Review: *The White Nights*, Pages from a Russian Doctor's Notebook, by Boris Sokoloff, M.D. The Devin-Adair Company, 23 East 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y., price $3.75.

An army physician in pre-Communist Russia, Dr. Sokoloff was elected to the democratic Constituent Assembly by the Army's southwestern sector in 1917. He was appointed head of the defense committee, but the committee had been formed too late and Lenin's Communists overthrew Kerensky's government.

Dr. Sokoloff was in the midst of this revolutionary violence and turmoil, and he tells dramatically of the fall of the Winter Palace as he witnessed it. His attempts to forewarn and forearm Kerensky against the danger ended in a series of frustrations.

Believing in direct action, Sokoloff recounts his role in the attempt to assassinate Lenin. He also was active in the drives to rid the World War I regiments of their hard-core Communist groups.

Later, attempting to flee across the frozen White Sea in an icecutter, Dr. Sokoloff was landed and put under arrest as an associate of Kerensky. He was condemned to death in notorious Boutyrki Prison, only to receive a last-minute reprieve.

Dr. Sokoloff reveals for the first time the intimate conversations between Lenin and Dr. Ivan Pavlov which laid the groundwork for the fantastic Soviet experiment in standardizing human thought and behavior.

Letter from DR. AND MRS. WALTER F. SCHWARTZ, Pasadena, Calif.: "We used to send fruit baskets, etc., to our doctor friends who through professional courtesy cared for our children during the year. Now, we send them HUMAN EVENTS — and give them something really 'meaty' to digest. Your written words save us many hours of talking and we are most grateful for your excellent reporting of current events and trends."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

Bound Volumes for 1956 — indexed — may now be ordered for March delivery. Regular price, $15; pre-publication price, accepted until December 31, $7.50 each.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIII, No. 43 HUMAN EVENTS October 27, 1956

Article Section

LABOR MONOPOLY RESTS ON VIOLENCE

By DONALD R. RICHBERG

EDITOR'S NOTE: There IS something every reader of HUMAN EVENTS can do about the problem described by Mr. Richberg, former Chairman of the National Recovery Administration. You can send copies of this article to all of your friends with a note to them to pass on copies to all of their friends. And each reader — perhaps with several others — can call upon his Congressman, when he is at home, asking what he intends to do about it. If you can't do that, write your Congressman — and especially your two Senators — asking them what measures they propose to introduce to cure this intolerable condition.

THE monopolistic powers of American labor unions are not revealed by statistics of total membership. Otherwise it might be assumed that 17,000,000 unionists could not monopolize employments filled by over 50,000,000 industrial workers.

But a different picture is presented when key industries are viewed. Over 1,400,000 unionized automobile workers can paralyze not only a major industry but scores of other industries dependent on automobile manufacturing. Over 1,300,000 union teamsters can not only stop vital transportation to advance their own interests, but can, and do, aid scores of smaller unions to force their demands on employers dependent on teamster hauling.

Over 1,250,000 steel workers have proved their ability to halt all production of products most essential to continued economic health. Six hundred thousand mine workers can, and have, shut down the coal industry even in a time of war. Even smaller unions of longshoremen, building workers, electrical, textile and garment workers, printing and telephone employees, and others too numerous to mention have demonstrated a capacity to exercise monopoly controls over local, sectional or national industries.

The simple fact is that all unions seek monopoly powers so they may transform collective bargaining into collective coercion and compel the acceptance of demands for wages and working conditions which would never be agreed to voluntarily. This is not the demonstration of a special wickedness among union officials. It is a natural ambition common to all human beings to relieve themselves of the uncertainties and losses of fair competition by acquiring a power to make others yield to force when persuasion fails to achieve one's selfish aims.

The only way a free economy can be preserved is for the Government to write and enforce laws preventing and prohibiting the acquisition and use of monopoly powers by anyone. Contrary to this clear obligation upon our Government, labor unions have been granted special aids to become monopolists and a special exemption from prosecution under the anti-trust laws.

The reason for this extraordinary favoritism is found in a once widely approved effort to build up the power of labor unions as a counterforce against the inherently monopolistic powers of big business. Against business monopolies there were 25 years of intensive public education by political leaders from John Sherman to Woodrow Wilson. A deep-seated antagonism to big business monopolies was developed which has been kept vigorously alive ever since by politicians ranging all the way from statesmen to demagogues.

But, from the time of President Wilson, and the passing of the Clayton Act exempting labor unions from anti-trust prosecutions, there has persisted the illusion that labor union monopolies were desirable and not, like business monopolies, destructive of a free economy. This illusion has been so prevalent that the AF of L and CIO even had the audacity to argue in the Supreme Court that monopoly power was the proper and ideal objective of all labor organizations although obviously a sinful objective for any business organization.

Before discussing further the fallacy of this idea, which even the Supreme Court described as "startling," let us consider just how this growth of monopoly power has developed. Thereby we may see more clearly the weak spots in the law and in public opinion that have supported the rise of centralized economic power in labor unions to unprecedented and intolerable heights.

Statistical indications have been given of the present size of labor unions controlling our most vital industries. But, to show how recently and how rapidly these union monopolies have developed, one

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more astonishing statistic should be recorded. The total membership of all labor unions, according to Department of Labor estimates, was less than three million in 1933 and over 17 million 20 years later. Most of this rise came from 3,700,000 in 1935 to 14,800,000 in 1945. It is obvious that the enactment of the Wagner Act and its favorable administration for ten years were largely responsible for this extraordinary expansion of membership.

Thus we have the clearest evidence that Government aid played a large part in the growth of the present labor monopolies. Perhaps a most revealing story of how monopoly control has grown in one of our most vital industries has been written by the railway labor unions. These are often regarded as exceptionally reliable, conservative and independent labor organizations. Yet it is commonly forgotten that all of them except the four transportation brotherhoods are really national AF of L unions. Such are, for example, the electrical workers, machinists, sheet metal workers, carmen, clerks and telegraphers.

The railway unions were the first to obtain the valuable aid of a Federal law in the Railway Labor Act enacted in 1926. As a pioneer document, of which I was the chief draftsman, let me call attention to the all-important principle of reciprocal rights and duties for employers and employees written into that law. It provided, as a result, an instrument of peace, not an encouragement of strife.

I may add here a personal note that it was the one-sided bias of the Wagner Act enacted nine years later that caused me to withdraw from its drafting and to continue to this day to be a persistent opponent of that sort of class favoritism in legislation.

The Railway Labor Act did not provide an invitation to labor to monopolize all the employments in an industry. Indeed it appeared to have left the door open to considerable employer influence in labor relations; so that in 1934 the unions sought, and obtained, amendments more severely restricting employer interference or coercion in the selection of representatives or conduct of collective bargaining. But even the 1934 amendments preserved many protections of employers from abuses of power and arbitrary strikes by the unions. The law clearly forbade not only company unions but also monopolistic union shop contracts.

Under this Act, as amended in 1934, the railway unions grew and prospered for 17 years with nothing but a few abortive and brief strikes to mar a record of industrial peace which has no parallel in a major American industry. The unions meanwhile increased their numbers from a total of less than 500,000 members in 1935 to over 1,700,000 in less than 20 years. Yet in 1951, greedy for more power and revenues, they persuaded Congress to amend the Railway Labor Act to permit them to use employer coercion through union shop agreements to compel all railway workers to join a union or lose their jobs.

This demand for compulsory unionism, which is now prevalent throughout organized labor, is the strongest evidence of the monopolistic purposes of the unions. The railway unions, for example, did not need to conscript a small percentage of nonunion employees in order to have union security. Their witnesses testified before Congress they had ample bargaining power with a law that gave the majority representative the privilege of binding all minorities by a trade agreement.

George M. Harrison, President of the Clerks and chief labor witness, testified that the unions held over 4,400 contracts on 99 per cent of the railway mileage. The main reason they gave for demanding compulsory unionism was that they wanted not only dues from everyone, but also more power to discipline all members.

IN PRESSING their compulsory legislation in Congress and later before a Presidential Emergency Board, the unions assumed to themselves a right to exercise governmental powers over a society of workers exactly in accord with their arguments in the Supreme Court in 1949. Harrison told Congress frankly that he wanted compulsory membership, not only to bring in new members and their dues, but also to increase his power of discipline over old members. In the same vein, he later complained to the Emergency Board that he had to police an organization of 300,000 persons without the police powers which the government of such a large city would exercise. Now think of the police power given by compelling all workers to join a union and pay it tribute and submit to its discipline or else lose their livelihood!

The same arrogant desire for governmental power was boldly explained to the Supreme Court a few years previously when the AF of L brief opposing state right-to-work laws made these assertions:

"The worker becomes a member of an economic society when he takes employment. . . . The Union is the organization or government of this society formed by the right of association. . . . It has in a sense the powers and responsibilities of a government."

This concept of labor unions as the government of an economic state, within and dominating a political state, is one which has grown and blossomed with the growth of monopolistic powers which are not only tolerated but actually fostered by our political governments. It is most surprising, how-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever, that the socialistic, totalitarian-minded labor leaders of the present day still regard themselves as devoted to a democratic form of government supported by and supporting a competitive system of free enterprise.

They will in one breath denounce all competition between workers, proclaiming and exercising monopoly powers, and in the next breath denounce business monopolies. In the same AF of L brief, from which I have quoted, the argument was made in one paragraph that "workers cannot thrive but can only die under competition between themselves," and they must have "the right to eliminate wage competition," but businessmen must not have "the right to eliminate price competition."

Just how price competition is to be maintained, when labor monopolies dictate to entire industries labor costs, production standards and every vital element that determines prices, cannot be easily explained. But we might call attention to the coal industry, where a labor dictator, exercising complete monopoly power, established a three-day work week by fiat and, with no appreciable opposition, has fixed for years all the wages which absolutely determine the price of coal.

A distinguished political economist, testifying before a Senate committee investigating labor monopolies (Dr. John V. Van Sickle, Feb. 23, 1950), flatly asserted: "Big labor threatens American capitalism." He acknowledged that "big business collectivism in industry compels an ultimate collectivism in government." In other words, the product of private monopoly is a demand for Government monopoly, which is socialism. Dr. Van Sickle continued:

> **"It is equally true that big labor collectivism also compels collectivism in Government. Indeed the threat from the side of organized labor is greater than that of the side of business for the simple reason that organized labor's power is vastly greater than that of business. The owners of vital private businesses would never dare expose the public to the hardships to which they have been repeatedly submitted by powerful national unions, not merely in times of peace, but in times of war, when our national existence was at stake. Moreover, the competition of substitutes and the march of technology drastically limit business' control of the market. Business does not now possess, and never has possessed, the crippling power that organized labor possesses and uses."**

Here is a plain and scientifically accurate statement of a menace which was confronting the American people when this statement was made over six years ago. This menace has grown greater with every passing year. The menace of labor monopolies to a free economy, to the maintenance of a competitive system of free enterprise — indeed, the menace to maintaining a free government of a free people — is much more evident and threatening today than six years ago. Yet there is no more likelihood today than in 1950 that necessary and obvious Government action will be taken to curb further advances and aggressions of these ever larger and stronger private monopolies.

Today we are faced with a recent merger of the two great labor federations, the AF of L and the CIO, for the declared purpose of limiting competition between them.

Today we are faced with sweeping demands that the right of labor unions to impose compulsory unionism be accepted and that all state and federal laws sustaining the constitutional right of a worker to refuse to join a labor union be repealed.

Today we hear loud threats that, unless politicians become more subservient to labor demands, they will be defeated and replaced by more labor puppets than now disgrace our public offices.

Today we find big labor supporting every program for bigger and bigger Government with only one qualification: that big labor remain the one dominant element in our society which by legal and illegal exemption from the criminal laws can exert a coercive power over us greater than that of Government.

THE EXEMPTION of the biggest monopolies in the nation from subjection to the anti-monopoly laws is particularly harmful because, in labor unions, we find combined the coercive powers of economic violence and physical violence. The economic coercion in fact rests largely on the physical coercion without which labor demands could not be enforced. Despite notorious exceptions, we hear much less nowadays about physical violence in strikes than a few years ago. This is because the techniques of mass picketing, injuring, assaulting and intimidating opponents of a strike have been so well worked out and so universally free from Government restraint or punishment that they need to be used only rarely. In most instances, when a strike is called, there is either immediate submission to the union demands or submission to the absolute stoppage of production in accordance with union orders.

A modern strike becomes, accordingly, largely a trial of financial strength: how long can the employer endure his losses? how long will the workers endure their losses? Sometimes the question is: how long will the public injuries be tolerable? But do not for one minute think that peaceful strikes would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

succeed if there were not behind the union's peaceful activities the threat of reckless violence if that should become necessary to prevent the employer from filling the jobs vacated but not abandoned by the strikers.

The so-called right-to-strike is not in fact simply the right to quit a job. It has been well described as the right to hold a job while not working at it, the right not only to stop working, but also to prevent any other person from taking the striker's job.

That is why the foul shape of terrorism is always lurking in the shadows behind the most peaceful appearing strike. If any real effort is made by employers to keep operating and by willing workers to work despite a strike ban, then suddenly appears crude violence in support of the strike — always hypocritically disavowed by the strike leaders.

But dynamiting, stench bombing, train wrecking, cable cutting, physical assaults and intimidation of would-be workers and their families do not happen by mere coincidence as spontaneous outbursts of individual violence. They are part and parcel of the mass picketing, the auto smashing and similar organized lawlessness which are conceded to be authorized strike activities.

The fragmentary and inadequate newspaper reports of recent strike violence against the Louisville and Nashville, the Southern Telephone Company, the Perfect Circle plant, and the Kohler Company should have at least made it plain that terrorism lurks behind every strike threat, even by the most respectable and comparatively law-abiding unions. It should be doubly plain why such organizations, with extensive open records of law-defying violence, seldom need actually to begin a terroristic program. The strike call itself is enough to warn any opposition of the wrath and ruin that will follow any attempt to break the strike.

There is no mystery about the source or existence of labor union monopolies. They are born out of legalized power of lawless violence.

The opinions of the Supreme Court are full of criticisms and helpless rebukes of labor union lawlessness. One opinion years ago pointed out that the law it was laying down permitted labor unions in combination with business groups "to shift our society from a competitive to a monopolistic economy." "But," said the Court, "the desirability of such exemption of labor unions is a question for the determination of Congress."

There is no tough riddle in the question: how can these monopolies be curbed and these monopolistic powers be destroyed? The answer is a simple one:

First, subject labor union monopolies to the same prohibitory laws and remedies which are enforced against business monopolies.

Second, subject the criminal lawlessness by which strikes are maintained to the same Federal and state criminal laws that are enforced against assaulting, maiming and killing, terrorism, and destruction of property, when they occur anywhere except in a labor dispute.

It isn't the difficulty of this problem — of analyzing and solving it — that prevents a solution. It is simply the political, financial and corrupting powers of the labor union oligarchies that stifle every effort to end or even to check their monopolistic controls over industry. There are comparatively few closely allied labor bosses in control of 17,000,000 harshly disciplined unionists. Their organizations are financed by an annual minimum of half-a-billion dollars regular dues. They are able in emergencies to raise millions more for propaganda, and political contributions that too closely resemble plain bribery.

THESE LAWLESS aggregations are supported by thousands of well-meaning, deluded people, as well as by hundreds of thousands of half-socialists, who regard labor unions as a great democratic opposition to what might otherwise become a tyrannical conspiracy of big business operators to exploit the people. Contrary to this delusion, the American people are actually being exploited today as never before by labor union monopolies exercising arbitrary and often very foolish controls over a free enterprise system to which they profess devotion, but which they are actually fast destroying.

To write an article like this seems to be like crying in the wilderness. But to one who grew up with the labor movement and did all he could to aid in the development of strong, responsible, democratic labor unions, there is such a tragedy in this super-growth of labor bossism into menacing national monopolies that the least I can do is to cry aloud, even in a wilderness of confused miseducated public opinion.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED